

Ser. No. 10/033,317

PU010323

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1-20 are rejected.

Claims 1 and 10 are amended.

Claims 8 and 18 are cancelled and are incorporated into Claims 1 and 10, respectively.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate limitations from now cancelled Claim 8 regarding the exclusion of the playback of a video clip in view of a parental control. Support for this amendment is found in the specification on page 6, lines 17-25, cancelled Claim 8, and in other places.

Claim 10 is amended to incorporate limitations from now cancelled Claim 18 regarding the exclusion of the playback of a video clip in view of a parental control. Support for this amendment is found in the specification on page 6, lines 17-25, cancelled Claim 18, and in other places.

No new matter was added in view of these amendments.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Schein et al. (U.S. Patent # 6,075,575 hereafter referred to as 'Schein'). Applicants disagree with this ground of rejection.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate Claim 8 as to claim that the "the launching of the video clip preview is inhibited if a program corresponding to the video clip preview and corresponding to the highlighted program titled cell is restricted according to a user profile based parental control". The operation of parental controls controlling the playback of a video clip preview is neither disclosed nor suggested in Schein. Applicants note that this is also acknowledged by the Examiner in the rejection to Claim 8, which has now been incorporated into Claim 1.

Schein discloses a procedure for creating a favorites list (see Schein, col. 12, lines 34-67). This operation of Schein is not related to excluding content-rated programs and an associated video clip preview using a parental control, as

Ser. No. 10/033,317

PU010323

claimed in Claim 1. Furthermore, nothing in Schein either discloses or suggests an operation of using a parental control to restrict the viewing of video clip previews of content-rated programs.

For the forgoing reasons, Claim 1 is allowable and Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to this claim. Claim 10 is allowable for the reasons listed in connection for Claim 1 because Claim 10 possesses the same claim limitations as Claim 1. Applicants request the removal of the rejection to Claim 10, as well.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTIONS

A. Rejection of Claim 8 (now as amended Claim 1) and Claim 18 (now amended as Claim 10)

The Examiner rejected previously filed Claims 8 and 18 (now incorporated in Claims 1 and 10, respectively) under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable by Schein in view of Maissel et al. (U.S. Patent #6,637,029, hereafter referred to as 'Maissel'). Applicants disagree.

Claim 1, as amended claims the elements of "browsing and navigating through the grid guide to highlight a program titled cell and "the display of the video clip preview is inhibited if a program corresponding to the video clip preview and corresponding to the highlighted program titled cell is restricted according to a user profile based parental control". These claimed elements are neither disclosed nor suggested in Schein or Maissel, alone or in combination.

Specifically in the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejected cancelled Claim 8 (now incorporated into Claim 1) as being disclosed by Maissel where "a viewer preference profile including parental control information which may be used to eliminate certain programs having certain ratings from the program guide so that they are suitable for viewing by children." (Final Rejection, page 5, lines 6-12).

Applicants note the elimination of programs described in Maissel is the actual elimination of a program listing in the program guide or the actual modification of "objectionable descriptions and/or icons so that they are suitable for viewing by children," (Maissel, col. 14, lines 24-33). This removal of a program

PU010323

Ser. No. 10/033,317

listing from a program guide, as described in Maissel, would mean that such a program listing could not be highlighted, as claimed in Claim 1, because such a program listing would be excluded from the electronic program guide. Other modifications to an electronic program guide are described in Maissel such as changing the order of program listings, changing the order of channels, removing certain programs from the program guide, highlighting certain programs, or de-highlighting certain programs in the program guide (Maissel, col. 13, lines 54-67).

Hence, Schein combined with Maissel teaches that the listings in a program guide would be modified in view of parental control information. This combination of references is not the same thing as "browsing and navigating through the grid guide to highlight a program titled cell and "the display of the video clip preview is inhibited if a program corresponding to the video clip preview and corresponding to the highlighted program titled cell is restricted according to a user profile based parental control" as claimed in Claim 1.

For the forgoing reasons, Claim 1 is allowable and Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to this claim. Claim 10 is allowable for the reasons listed in connection for Claim 1 because Claim 10 possesses the same claim limitations as Claim 1. Applicants request the removal of the rejection to Claim 10, as well.

B. Rejection of Claims 2-5 and 11-14

The Examiner rejected Claims 2-5 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Schein in view of Rowe et al. (U.S. Patent #5,812,123, hereafter referred to as 'Rowe'). Applicants disagree.

For the forgoing reasons listed above for Claims 1 and 10, dependent Claims 2-5 and dependent Claims 11-14 are patentable, as these claims depend on Claims 1 and 10, respectively. Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to these claims.

C. Rejection of Claims 6, 7, 9, and 15-17

PU010323

Ser. No. 10/033,317

The Examiner rejected Claims 6, 7, 9, and 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Schein in view of Rowe and in further view of Reynolds (U.S. Patent # 6,563,515). Applicants disagree.

For the forgoing reasons listed above for Claims 1 and 10, dependent Claims 6, 7, and 9 and dependent Claims 15-17 are patentable, as these claims depend on Claims 1 and 10, respectively. Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to these claims.

D. Rejection of Claims 19 and 20

The Examiner rejected Claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein. Applicants disagree.

For the forgoing reasons listed above for Claims 1 and 10, dependent Claims 19 and 20 are patentable, as these claims depend on Claim 10. Applicants request that the Examiner remove the rejection to these claims.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6809, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Applicants are filing a Request for Continuing Examination and a request for a one-month extension under 37 C.F.R. 1.116(a) with this response. Any additional fees owed in connection with this response are to be charged to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Joel M. Fogelson

PU010323

Ser. No. 10/033,317

Reg. No. 43, 613
Phone (609) 734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing Inc.
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
September 14, 2004

10